

**STATE ALLOCATION BOARD**

1130 K Street, Suite 400  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
<http://www.dgs.ca.gov/opsc>



**Date:** September 22, 2005

**To:** Interested Parties

**Subject:** **NOTICE OF THE STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

Notice is hereby provided that the State Allocation Board Implementation Committee will hold a meeting on Friday, October 7, 2005 (9:30 am - 3:30 pm) in the Legislative Office Building, located at 1020 N Street, Room 100 in Sacramento.

The Implementation Committee's proposed agenda is as follows:

1. Senate Bill 550 Good Repair State Standards Report

Any interested person may present public testimony or comments at this meeting regarding the issues scheduled for discussion. Any public input regarding unscheduled issues should be presented in writing, which may then be scheduled for a future meeting. For additional information, please contact Ms. Linda Martinez at (916) 445-3159.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "MAVONNE GARRITY".

MAVONNE GARRITY, Chairperson  
State Allocation Board Implementation Committee

MG:lm

STATE ALLOCATION BOARD  
IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE  
October 7, 2005

Senate Bill 550 Good Repair State Standards Report

PURPOSE

To discuss the attached draft report that presents various options for a permanent state school facility standard of good repair.

BACKGROUND

Senate Bill (SB) 550, Chapter 900, Statutes of 2004 (Vasconcellos) was enacted as a part of the settlement agreement in the case of *Williams v. State of California*. SB 550, specifically Education Code Section 17002, requires the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) to report to the Governor and Legislature on options for state standards of good repair by December 31, 2005.

STAFF COMMENTS

The attached draft report is a compilation of various alternatives and options to define good repair of a school facility based on feedback on the IEI, a review of existing standards used by school districts and other agencies in California, as well as what other states and the federal government have developed.

To assist in the preparation of the report, the OPSC formed a small working group consisting of representatives from county offices of education, school districts, the California Department of Education, the Coalition for Adequate School Housing, as well as, a professional architect and members of the OPSC Staff. The report incorporates feedback the OPSC received from the workgroup.

DRAFT

*GOOD REPAIR REPORT:*  
OPTIONS FOR A PERMANENT  
STATE STANDARD

REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATURE  
OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION  
OCTOBER 7, 2005

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b><u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u></b>	<b><u>1</u></b>
<b><u>BACKGROUND</u></b>	<b><u>2</u></b>
<b><u>RESEARCH ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS</u></b>	<b><u>3</u></b>
INTERIM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT	3
ANALYSIS	3
RESEARCH FINDINGS	5
OTHER STATES AND ENTITIES	5
ANALYSIS	5
RESEARCH FINDINGS	10
<b><u>CONSIDERATIONS &amp; RECOMMENDATIONS</u></b>	<b><u>14</u></b>
COMPONENTS	14
LEVEL OF DETAIL	15
FORMAT OF STANDARDS	16
RATING AND SCORING MECHANISM	17
ENFORCEMENT OF STANDARDS	17
INTEGRATION WITH OTHER WILLIAMS REQUIREMENTS	18
<b><u>CONCLUSION</u></b>	<b><u>19</u></b>
<b><u>APPENDIX A</u></b>	<b><u>20</u></b>
<b><u>APPENDIX B</u></b>	<b><u>21</u></b>
<b><u>APPENDIX C</u></b>	<b><u>22</u></b>
<b><u>APPENDIX D</u></b>	<b><u>23</u></b>
<b><u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u></b>	<b><u>26</u></b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The case of *Williams, et al vs. State of California (Williams)* focused on three main components: teacher credentials, access to textbooks, and school facilities. In August 2004, a settlement agreement was negotiated between the parties that promoted the passage of five pieces of legislation.<sup>1</sup> The terms of the *Williams* case settlement and associated funding are intended to ensure that all students have textbooks, qualified teachers, and clean, safe, and functional school facilities.

The Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) is presenting this report to the Legislature and Governor to assist in the development of a permanent State standard for the condition of California's public school facilities in response to one of those resulting laws, Education Code Section 17002, as amended by Senate Bill 550 (Chapter 900, Statutes of 2004, Vasconcellos). The goal of this report is to provide options for consideration as well as some suggested recommendations from OPSC Staff and other school facility stakeholders.

The information in this report is a compilation and analysis of options and alternatives to define good repair standards for school facilities based on feedback about the Interim Evaluation Instrument, a review of existing standards used by school districts or other agencies in California, and research on what other states and the federal government have developed. In looking at these other methods of evaluating school facilities, further analysis is conducted on the school components that must be assessed, the level of detail in the assessment, the format of the evaluation tool, the need for a rating and/or scoring system, enforcement of these standards, and the integration of the standards with other facility programs and requirements already in place.

To accomplish this task, the OPSC formed a small workgroup of school facility experts and practitioners to discuss viable options that would be feasible in a school setting. This report was also discussed at the October 2005 State Allocation Board (SAB) Implementation Committee meeting to receive public feedback. The SAB Implementation Committee is made up of members representing various school-related associations, councils, and State departments with a vested interest in policy as it relates to school construction and funding. Meetings are attended by district representatives, consultants, architects, and other parties interested in school facilities.

California can develop standards that are very broad in nature or very specific and detailed. In the end, the OPSC's findings suggest that the State standard for good repair should be described in statute in narrative form and be composed of the assessment of more than a dozen school components. The method or tool in which to conduct the assessment would not be prescribed in law; however, the statute would specify that it include a rating and scoring system. The information that follows represents what we believe to be viable options and recommendations that will provide the Governor and Legislature a framework for developing a standard that is flexible for long-term, statewide use and that fulfills the goal of having clean, safe and functional school facilities in California.

---

<sup>1</sup> Senate Bill 6 (Alpert), Chapter 899, Statutes 2004; Senate Bill 550 (Vasconcellos), Chapter 900, Statutes 2004; Assembly Bill 1550 (Daucher), Chapter 901, Statutes 2004; Assembly Bill 3001 (Nunez), Chapter 902, Statutes 2004; Assembly Bill 2727 (Daucher), Chapter 903, Statutes 2004

## BACKGROUND

In 2000, a lawsuit was filed against the State of California by the American Civil Liberties Union and other parties on behalf of California's school children, which became known as *Williams, et al vs. State of California (Williams)*. The litigation focused on three specific aspects of education: instructional materials, teacher qualifications, and school facility maintenance and overcapacity. At the close of the 2004 legislative session, resolution between the parties was reached and several bills were enacted as part of the settlement agreement in the *Williams* case. With the approval of the legislation and the Governor's signature, the historic *Williams* lawsuit reached final settlement. The terms of California's *Williams* settlement are aimed to ensure that all of California's pupils have adequate textbooks, qualified teachers, and that their schools are clean, safe and functional.

The State Allocation Board (SAB) and the Office of Public School Construction (OPSC) played a role in implementing the elements of legislation impacting school facilities. Specifically, Education Code Section 17002 modified by Senate Bill 550 (Vasconcellos), Chapter 900, Statutes of 2004, required the OPSC to develop an instrument to be used on an interim basis, which would identify if a school facility is in good repair meaning it is clean, safe and functional. (See Appendix A for complete statutory language.) This tool, known as the Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI), was created and made operational by the end of January 2005, and is the current definition of good repair. Good repair had consistently been used in various school facility sections of the Education Code; however, this is the first time statute has further defined its meaning.

Furthermore, Education Code Section 17002 requires the OPSC to report and make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature regarding options for State standards as an alternative to the IEI. This report begins the second phase of implementation in adopting a permanent state standard for good repair. Statute specifies that a permanent standard for good repair be adopted by the Governor and the Legislature no later than September 1, 2006.

To assist in preparing this report and the development of options for final state standards, the OPSC formed a workgroup of school facility experts and practitioners. The primary goal of the group was to explore a multitude of practical options for State school facility standards. Input from the workgroup is the foundation of the report as well as comments received from other interested parties through discussions held during a recent SAB Implementation Committee meeting.

This report contains an analysis of the IEI, research findings of eight evaluations from other states, tools developed by other entities in California, considerations for discussion, and recommendations to assist with the development of permanent state standards.

## RESEARCH ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The objective of this report differs slightly from the charge OPSC had earlier this year to develop an instrument to measure good repair. Rather than developing an instrument for school districts and county offices of education, this report addresses the criteria that should be considered in developing a permanent State definition of good repair and not necessarily the format or means of communicating those standards. This report therefore includes an analysis of the current standard, the IEI, and a review of existing standards used by various entities, including school districts, other states, and the federal government.

### *Interim Evaluation Instrument*

#### ANALYSIS

The IEI was adopted by the SAB on January 26, 2005 (see Appendix B). The IEI is the definition of good repair and measures whether a school facility is maintained in a manner that is clean, safe, and functional. Its design is largely based upon the Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team (FCMAT) school evaluation form that was created as a monitoring tool for Compton Unified School District. Thirteen components of a school facility are evaluated as part of the IEI (e.g. interior surfaces, school grounds, fire/life safety, etc). In its current form, the IEI is designed for use by district staff or other individuals without any formal construction knowledge or training and is intended to be a visual inspection of a school facility. Evaluators answer yes or no to a series of questions regarding various components. A no response indicates that a deficiency is present. The following chart provides an overview of the IEI:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA INTERIM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT	
Basis	Legislation required the OPSC to develop an interim tool to measure whether or not school facilities are in good repair.
Conducted By	School district and county office of education staff.
Method	Visual inspection using a checklist.
Description	Checklist containing 13 broad categories, with descriptive statements that require a "yes" or "no" response from the user. Includes space for specific comments on any deficiencies observed.
Frequency	As needed basis pursuant to Senate Bill 550, as described in the chart below.
Use of Results	To ensure compliance with the litigation settlement and to ensure that school facilities are maintained in a manner that is clean, safe and functional.
Rater Qualifications	Designed for use by anyone regardless of knowledge of school facilities construction.
Rating	None
Scoring	None

Each school district or county office of education in California will use the IEI at some point. The following chart provides information on the multiple uses of the IEI depending upon the entity:

Entity	Use
School Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist in completing the school facility section of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) for all district schools.</li> <li>Serve as a Facilities Inspection System (FIS) after July 1, 2005, for all schools in the district, if participating in the School Facility Program (SFP) or Deferred Maintenance Program (DMP) to ensure each school is maintained in good repair.</li> </ul>
County Offices of Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assist in completing the school facility section of the SARC for all schools.</li> <li>Serve as a FIS after July 1, 2005, for all county-operated schools, if participating in the SFP or DMP.</li> <li>Assist in meeting oversight responsibilities at schools with deciles of 1-3 on the 2003 Academic Performance Index (API) identified on a listing published by the California Department of Education to verify SARC information and identify health and safety conditions.</li> </ul>

As the above chart indicates, the information gathered from the IEI is used by different entities to comply with several different *Williams* settlement requirements. For example, the information a school district gathers by completing an IEI on a specific school site is to be reflected in the facility section of the school's SARC. The information on the SARC is used by parents and other interested parties to make informed decisions about their children's school. If a school was ranked in deciles 1 to 3 on the 2003 API, then the local county office of education will act as a second layer of review of this information during annual visits to ensure that the SARC information is accurately reported. While at the school sites, county office of education personnel are also looking for health and safety hazards identified on the IEI.

The OPSC is aware that some county offices of education or school districts modified the State's IEI to better suit their individual situation at the local level. It is the OPSC's premise that the components in the IEI are minimum standards a school facility should meet to be considered in good repair and that as long as the minimum thirteen components are included, an alternative tool or instrument is acceptable. Completed IEIs are retained by either the school district or the county office of education and are not provided to the State.

To begin the process of researching alternative standards, it seemed logical to conduct an evaluation of the current tool, the IEI. Therefore, the OPSC developed a survey questionnaire for workgroup participants to complete. A complete copy of the survey is provided in Appendix C. The survey contained thirteen questions and the goal of the survey was to answer the following questions:

- What worked with the IEI and what did not?
- Are any components missing or unnecessary?
- Should there be an overall rating system?
- Should it be designed in a manner that allows a person with little or no facility experience to use it?



Survey responses are detailed in the charts provided in Appendix D<sup>2</sup>. At the time of the OPSC survey, the IEI had been in use for eight months by both school districts and county offices of education.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

The responses to the survey questions suggest that there are some components of a school facility that are currently not incorporated into the definition of good repair that should be considered in developing final standards, such as overall cleanliness, graffiti, playground safety, and parking lots.

The majority of respondents believed that the IEI is practical to use in a school setting, however most felt an overall rating system would be helpful in providing definitive results about a school site. Some felt the lack of a rating left too much to interpretation with no conclusive measurement or result. The minority felt a rating system would make the assessment too complex and inadvertently place the reviewer in a precarious position and subject to lawsuits.

The results of the IEI are relayed on each school's SARC and a majority of the respondents believed that the IEI was helpful in completing the SARC school facility section. In addition, a majority of the respondents believed that the IEI and the good repair standard should be designed to allow for a visual inspection of a school site by individuals with little or no knowledge of school facilities construction. Those respondents that believed school facility experts should be conducting the assessments felt it would give the evaluation more value as users with little school facilities background calls into question the integrity of the inspection.

Overall, many believed that the IEI is simple, easy to use and understand, yet comprehensive enough to focus on the important building components and systems.

## *Other States and Entities*

## ANALYSIS

In looking for alternatives, it became apparent that California is not alone in its endeavor to provide school facility standards for its students. Over the past several years, other states and entities have also been developing standards or assessment tools. In our research, we looked at evaluation systems from FCMAT, Los Angeles Unified School District, the United States Government Accountability Office (formerly known as the General Accounting Office), New York City Public Schools, and the following states: Alaska, Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Washington and Wisconsin. In some states, similar to California, litigation was the cause of performing a school facility evaluation, while other states use the information to project future capital facility project costs. Some evaluations were extremely detailed, collecting specific facility information, types and age of building components, and providing cost analysis of facility needs.

<sup>2</sup> Question One has not been included as it has no bearing or added value to the research findings.

The following charts summarize the research findings based upon specific commonalities found in each evaluation:

<b>FISCAL CRISIS MANAGEMENT AND ASSISTANCE TEAM</b>	
Basis	As part of their charter for fiscal oversight of California school districts, FCMAT developed this tool specifically for Compton Unified School District as a result of litigation.
Conducted By	FCMAT staff
Method	"Campus/Facility Review": Site evaluation performed by FCMAT staff for the specific district.
Description	Review using nine broad categories with subcategories. Addresses aspects other than those related specifically to school facilities. The review includes definitions.
Frequency	As needed basis.
Use of Results	Ensure compliance with the litigation settlement.
Rater Qualifications	Designed for use by anyone.
Rating	2-prong (Yes/No)
Scoring	A through F grading

<b>LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT</b>	
Basis	Internal need to monitor school facilities in the District.
Conducted By	District staff---LAUSD Office of Environmental Health and Safety (OEHS)
Method	"School Safety Compliance Checklist": Site evaluation to be used by OEHS inspectors.
Description	Checklist developed to assess compliance with federal, state and District requirements. 14 health and safety standards and threshold questions. Includes guidebook of standards.
Frequency	Ongoing, on a quarterly basis.
Use of Results	Publish scorecard for parents, media, teachers, and general public consumption.
Rater Qualifications	Very technical, designed for use by District personnel.
Rating and Scoring	2-prong (Yes/No) based on threshold of a compliance score of 1-10. Converted to a percentage and assigned a numerical value of 0-4 which is further converted to an overall rating of "Good, Fair, or Poor".

<b>STATE of ALASKA</b>	
Basis	An established guide for the convenience of schools to ensure school facility compliance with codes/regulations/guidelines. Assumes no liability for its use.
Conducted By	Unknown (tool not mandatory).
Method	"School Condition Facility Survey": very long survey, yet not intended to be exhaustive and cover all areas of compliance.
Description	Survey focuses on four main sections: building envelope/structure, interior spaces, mechanical, and electrical. Rates each element as a stand-alone.
Frequency	Unknown (tool not mandatory).
Use of Results	Intended to provide recommendations for discrepancies observed, including repair cost information for school districts.
Rater Qualifications	Professional/tradespersons, or those trained in school maintenance
Rating	Combination: 2-prong (Yes/No) and 3-Prong (Good, Fair, Poor)
Scoring	Same as the rating system.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT	
Basis	Internal need to monitor school facilities.
Conducted By	State of Connecticut
Method	"School Facilities Survey": Evaluates broad facility categories and individual building ratings.
Description	Two-section survey requesting general site information, rates buildings and systems on numerical rating scale but includes definitions on how to rate, and requests information on planning and maintenance of the facilities. Internal database.
Frequency	On-going
Rater Qualifications	Unknown
Users	School districts and School Facilities Unit of the State Department of Education
Rating	0-4: 0=lowest, 4=highest. Includes definitions of each rating.
Scoring	Ratings are translated to "Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor, Missing"

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE	
Basis	A report, <i>School Facilities: America's School Report Differing Conditions</i> , was addressed to Congressional requestors, which focused on the "differences in the (1) condition of schools, (2) amount of funding needed to repair or upgrade facilities, and (3) number of students attending schools in inadequate condition by the following: location (state and region), community type, percentage of minority and poor students, and school level and size."
Conducted By	General Accounting Office
Method	"GAO Questionnaire for Local Education Agencies." Survey 10,000 schools with 10 site visits, including some audits where necessary.
Description	The study looked at broad categories like "inadequate buildings" or "inadequate features" and focused on physical/environmental conditions by state, region, and other aspects like demographics. Additionally, the report looked at funding needed by state, region, and "other characteristics." Finally, the report focused on the numbers of students learning under "inadequate conditions."
Frequency	One-time
Use of Results	In a report to Congress, generally provided a sense of the nature of school facilities nationwide. Available for public consumption.
Rater Qualifications	School officials at the local level.
Rating	For facilities aspect only: 6-prong (Excellent-Replace); A few Yes/No related to the existence of, for instance, air conditioner or not.
Scoring	Based on amount of "inadequate" or "unsatisfactory" findings at schools. Percentages in three categories: At least one inadequate building, at least one inadequate building feature, and at least one inadequate building and building feature. Additionally, the results were broken down by specific inadequacies, the number of students at inadequate schools, including student demographics, and other presentations of the numbers.

STATE OF ILLINOIS	
Basis	The Illinois “Health/Life Safety Handbook” was designed to offer guidelines and minimum standards that region superintendents are to ensure that their schools are meeting.
Conducted By	Regional superintendents.
Method	“Health/Life Safety Annual Inspection Checklist” and a “Ten-year Survey Report” are to be completed by the regional superintendents.
Description	The annual inspection is focused only on health/safety with regard to facility usage. For instance, all rooms should have a fire detection system and chemical labs should be properly equipped with eye protection. The ten-year survey is for ensuring proper upkeep of the facilities according to minimum standards.
Frequency	On-going
Use of Results	Compliance with minimum standards, and to call upon state officials in the case of findings of unsafe, unsanitary, or unfit for occupancy.
Rater Qualifications	State Superintendent of Education, Board of Education
Rating	5-prong: A through E (In Full Compliance-Non-compliance (D)/Continued Use for Temporary Facility (E))
Scoring	No scoring of facilities. Purpose is to find problems, fix problems and to provide notice.

STATE OF MARYLAND	
Basis	Legislation established a taskforce to oversee school facilities and determine whether or not the facilities were adequate to support educational programs in the state.
Conducted By	A workgroup, developed under the auspices of the taskforce, of state and local school and general facilities officials.
Method	School superintendents and facility planners were to enter their school’s information into an online database. The survey tool was developed by the workgroup.
Description	The tool included 31 fundamental standards based on current, federal, state and local standards, and a survey instrument. The survey included basic questions pertaining to the condition of schools, but also included information about capacity and a school’s “functional adequacy to support its educational programs” (p. 3, Presentation of Data, Facility Assessment Survey Maryland Public Schools)
Frequency	One-time
Use of Results	Report to the state entities charged with overseeing the condition of their public schools.
Rater Qualifications	Maryland State Department of Education
Rating	Performance standards and local standards, whether or not the standards were met.
Scoring	Percentages of school meeting standards.

NEW YORK CITY	
Basis	NYC School Construction Authority contracted with 3 entities to provide this information to the Board of Education for their 5-year capital plan.
Conducted By	3 consulting firms under contract with NYC School Construction Authority.
Method	Computerized assessment called a Building Condition Assessment Survey (BCAS).
Description	"Survey results, obtained mostly via objective rating criteria, provide "baseline" measurements of individual building conditions, the school system as a whole or any part thereof." "One question regarding an overall system such as "exteriors"...then extended down to four levels--interior, classroom, doors and wood."
Frequency	One-time
Use of Results	To implement the 5-year capital plan. "It provides a sound basis for long-range capital planning, a realistic and defensible estimate of "cost of good repair" and objective building condition information that designers can use to develop scopes of work."
Rater Qualifications	New York School Construction Authority
Rating	5-prong (Good, Fair to Good, Fair, Fair to Poor, and Poor)
Scoring	Deficiency is attached to a recommended action, which is attached to a "Purpose of Action": Life Safety, Structural, Regulation/Code, Security, Betterment, Cost Avoidance, Operations/Maintenance Savings, Aesthetics and Community. In the above coding system, certain repairs are considered betterment, whereas others would be life safety and take precedence. This system allows planners to distinguish between and prioritize available resources. Additionally, five urgency codes: 1) fail now, 2) fail within six months, 3) fail within 24 months, 4) no fail within 24 months and 5) no urgency. Weights were assigned to the systems and their components.

STATE OF WASHINGTON	
Basis	Response to legislation passed in 1991.
Conducted By	Local school districts
Method	"Building Condition Evaluation Manual", which is comprised of checklists of building components to be rated.
Description	This manual provides checklists and requires individuals to rate building components as a whole (e.g. electrical, floors, restrooms) as well as characteristics of each specific component. Provides a rating for each component as well as an overall school rating. Washington State later developed the "Health and Safety Guide for K-12 Schools". The entire document is a health and safety guide. Included within are the protocols for health officials to follow when conducting an "assessment" (not an "inspection," because it states that "inspection" connotes the presence of sanctions, which are not included in the state's sanctions) of a school. The protocols include areas of inspection to assess.
Frequency	Originally intended to be annual, but now it is periodic.
Use of Results	For the purpose of monitoring school facilities and to alert school officials of needed repairs.
Rater Qualifications	School district board of directors and school district superintendents.
Rating	4-prong rating system including Good, Fair, Poor, and Unsatisfactory.
Scoring	Converts individual ratings of system characteristics to an overall system score based on built-in tolerance levels.

STATE OF WISCONSIN	
Basis	In response to legislative action (Section 115.33(4)), Wisconsin, Statutes of 1998 requiring a “study of the physical condition and capacity of the public schools and their suitability for use as public schools.”
Conducted By	Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Method	“Wisconsin’s School Facility Survey”, (Part A – Physical Structure and Mechanical Features): questionnaire mailed to school districts to be answered on a school-by-school basis
Description	Somewhat subjective assessment, but includes definitions. Rates building components as a whole (e.g. electrical, floors, restrooms) versus characteristics of each specific component. Gathers facility information as well as preliminary costs estimates on repairs needed.
Frequency	One-time
Use of Results	Included in a report to the Wisconsin Legislature entitled <i>School Facilities Report: The Results of a Statewide Survey to Determine the Physical Condition &amp; Capacity of Wisconsin’s Public Schools</i> to determine future costs of repairs.
Rater Qualifications	School district personnel, administrators and maintenance and operations employees
Rating	7-prong: Excellent, Good, Adequate, Fair, Poor, Replace, and Not Applicable
Scoring	Same as the rating system

Another evaluation system explored was the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Healthy School Environments Assessment Tool (Healthy SEAT). The EPA is completing the development of the Healthy SEAT which will be available on-line and accessible to all school districts in the nation at no cost. This tool integrates all of the EPA programs for schools and addresses such environmental issues as chemical management, hazardous materials, and indoor air quality among many others. The tool also provides information on health, safety, and injury prevention programs of several other agencies including Occupational Safety and Health Administration, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Center for Disease Control/Division of Adolescent and School Health, and others. The tool is designed to assist school districts with regulatory compliance and improve the health of students and staff by ensuring that all potential environmental hazards in schools are being properly managed.

The Healthy SEAT is a completely voluntary tool and will contain the following elements: software and updates to be downloaded from the EPA Web Page, user’s manual, and a database file that runs on *Microsoft Access*. The database file will include checklists and guidebooks to use in the assessments that can be customized to fit the needs of individual school districts by allowing the school district officials to select the items to be included in the review. The components of the Healthy SEAT can also be customized to reflect state requirements.

While the information collected in EPA’s tool exceeds the level of information required in defining standards for California’s schools, it might be of assistance to school districts in monitoring the condition of their school facilities and complying with other *Williams* requirements.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

Through the collection of the data, the following general categories were identified as the reason(s) why individual states/entities performed an evaluation of school facilities: On-going Internal Monitoring, Response to Legislation/Litigation, Determination of Facility Condition and Cost Estimates, and Component of a Capital Facilities Plan. This information is useful in order to weigh the purpose of one evaluation against another when considering options.

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION				
Other States/Entities	Ongoing Internal Monitoring	Response to Legislation or Litigation	Determination of Future Costs or Condition of Facilities	Component of Capital Facility Plan
California's IEI		X		X
Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team	X	X		
Los Angeles Unified School District	X			
Alaska	X			
Connecticut	X			
Government Accountability Office			X	
Illinois	X			
Maryland		X	X	
New York City	X		X	X
Washington	X			
Wisconsin		X	X	
<b>TOTALS:</b> (not including California's IEI)	7	3	4	1

To analyze the data with regard to the components contained within each entity's evaluation, the data was categorized into five broad categories: Exterior Building Conditions, Mechanical Systems, Interior Building Conditions, Safety Building Codes, and Other. The following chart summarizes the categories that were considered for general school site facility condition evaluations. Findings for New York City are not included as specific component information was unavailable. Many states have guidelines or categories within evaluations that go farther than the categories listed below. For instance, Maryland and the United States Government Accountability Office include capacity, comfort, and educational adequacy components. Those categories are outside of the statutory parameters set for California, and therefore not included. The *Williams* case settlement legislation specifically requires that a facility be clean, safe, and functional (Education Code Section 17002 (d)). Therefore, the following chart includes only categories that relate to clean, safe, and functional in pursuit of a permanent standard of good repair.

# DRAFT

COMPARISON OF BUILDING COMPONENTS EVALUATED																								
OTHER STATES/ENTITIES	EXTERIOR BUILDING CONDITIONS					MECHANICAL SYSTEMS					INTERIOR BUILDING CONDITIONS					SAFETY/BUILDING CODE			OTHER					
	Foundation/Structure	Walls	Roof	Windows/Doors	Trim	Heating & Cooling	Plumbing	Electrical (Power)	Electrical (Lighting)	Ventilation	Flooring, Walls, Ceilings	Restrooms	Paint	Fixed Equipment	Cleanliness	Fire/Life Safety	ADA Compliance	Hazardous Materials (asbestos, lead, etc.)	Functionality	Potable Water	Graffiti	Playground Equipment	Landscape/ Litter	Roadways/ Walkways
California's – Interim Evaluation Instrument	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	
Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Team				X		X		X	X	X		X				X				X	X	X	X	
Los Angeles Unified School District				X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X
Alaska	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X		X	X	X
Connecticut			X			X	X		X	X	X	X			X		X	X		X	X		X	X
General Accounting Office	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X						
Illinois	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X					X		X						X
Maryland	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X				X	X	X	X	X				
Washington	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X				X			
TOTALS: (not including California's IEI)	6	6	8	7	4	8	7	7	9	9	7	6	4	3	3	8	6	6	2	5	3	4	4	3



To summarize the chart above, following is a list of the eight specific building components that were of importance to a majority of states/entities:

- Roofs
- Windows/Doors
- Heating/Cooling/Ventilation
- Plumbing
- Electrical Power
- Electrical Lighting
- Floors/Walls/Ceilings
- Fire/Life Safety

The IEI contains all but roofing. This aspect was considered during the development of the IEI but was excluded as it does not lend itself to a basic visual observation by untrained inspectors.

After looking at the specific facility categories, an important aspect of assessing a condition of a school is how the individual evaluator rates the condition of the building. Is the building adequate? Yes or No? Or is it a degree of adequacy? Very Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Very Unsatisfactory? One of the important aspects with regard to the usefulness of the rating system is the definition of “satisfactory” or “adequate.” Some states use handbooks of standards or guidelines based on building and safety codes and/or best practices. Others simply outline parameters or definitions to guide the individual in making appropriate ratings. In summary:

- Three states/entities utilize a Yes/No rating system based on definitions of adequacy or functionality, and Maryland’s is based on existing standards. While this basic rating mechanism is useful in these defined instances, California is seeking to use this evaluation/assessment to assist in establishing standards that do not currently exist for the State.
- Seven states/entities require the individual to rate the condition of individual components in a descriptive manner. The complexity of rating scales ranged from 3-pronged (Good, Fair, Poor) up to 7-pronged (Excellent, Good, Adequate, Fair, Poor, Replace, Not Applicable).
- Descriptors ranged from Good-Poor, Excellent-Replace, Full Compliance-Not in Compliance, and Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory.

## CONSIDERATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings from the research suggest that there are many different ways to approach the development of permanent state standards for good repair in California. Developing state standards should include considerations of the following:

- Components of the school,
- Level of detail to be included,
- Format of the standards,
- Use of a rating and scoring mechanism,
- Possibilities for enforcement, and
- Integration of the standards with other requirements of the *Williams* settlement.

Many of these are policy decisions that will need further discussion. The outcomes to these policy questions will have an impact on the meaningfulness of the standards and whether they will be widely used, be able to measure improvement, be adhered to, and accomplish the goal of improving California's school facilities.

### Components

### ANALYSIS

The current definition of good repair includes an evaluation of the cleanliness, functionality, and safety of thirteen various components of a school facility. Eight of which are items that, under the *Williams* settlement, are health and safety issues considered emergency facility needs. The IEI survey results and a review of other entities and states raise the possibility that additional items be considered when developing standards. Workgroup participants also suggested that any subsequent tools that are developed be organized by commonly known building systems, such as exterior envelope, structural, plumbing, electrical, etc. Additionally, participants felt strongly that overall cleanliness should be included as part of the standard. The following chart provides a current list of each area covered under the IEI and also items to consider:

OPTIONS	Existing Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gas System*</li> <li>• Mechanical Systems*</li> <li>• Window/Doors/Gates* (interior and exterior)</li> <li>• Interior Surfaces (walls, floors, ceilings)</li> <li>• Hazardous Materials* (interior and exterior)</li> <li>• Structural Damage*</li> <li>• Fire Safety</li> <li>• Electrical* (interior and exterior)</li> <li>• Pest/Vermin*</li> <li>• Drinking Fountains (interior and exterior)</li> <li>• Restrooms</li> <li>• Sewer*</li> <li>• Playground/School grounds</li> </ul>
	Potential Additions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graffiti</li> <li>• Parking lot surfaces and walkways</li> <li>• Site drainage</li> <li>• Exterior lighting</li> <li>• Overall cleanliness</li> </ul>

\*Emergency Facilities Needs per *Williams* legislation

## RECOMMENDATION

The components of the permanent state standards should, at a minimum, include the above thirteen standards which are covered within the IEI. Further, we recommend that parking lot surfaces, walkways, site drainage, and exterior lighting should also be included.

## *Level of Detail*

## ANALYSIS

In creating standards, the level of detail in which to address each school facility component and system is an important consideration. This is one of the most important considerations in developing permanent state standards that impacts the success or failure of meeting the goal of improving California's schools. The following chart reflects three approaches to consider including the benefits and drawbacks of each:

	LEVEL OF DETAIL	BENEFITS	DRAWBACKS
OPTIONS	Highly comprehensive: Reference state and local building codes, regulations, and provide prescriptive examples and information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear guidance for evaluators</li> <li>• Statewide uniformity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant resources required at the state and local level to implement and update</li> <li>• Requires strong school facility construction knowledge</li> <li>• Would be difficult to account for uniqueness in districts</li> </ul>
	Moderately detailed: Provide a single statement for each element/item followed by examples and information with an option for more narrative/comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides guidance for evaluators</li> <li>• Some local control</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some subjectivity is involved</li> <li>• Would not require school facility construction knowledge</li> </ul>
	Less prescriptive: single statements about the component without examples; allow each locality to elaborate on the details.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant local control</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be difficult for small school districts without resources to implement</li> <li>• Very subjective and lacks consistency</li> </ul>

There are several underlying issues that will impact this particular policy decision. Many participants in the workgroup expressed their belief that a high level of detail, if any, is not needed for the various components and should not go beyond the examples included currently in the IEI as overly prescriptive standards would be difficult to implement, enforce, and therefore become meaningless. Likewise, developing standards that provide little or no guidance would leave too much open for interpretation and again be meaningless. Without resources or assistance, the standards would simply not be further developed at the local level. A moderately detailed approach would allow a variety of individuals to monitor standards. Furthermore, it would not require specific school facility knowledge to complete but rather rely on basic reasoning skills of the evaluators. It is important that the standards developed provide clear guidance for the evaluators.

## RECOMMENDATION

Implement standards that are moderately detailed and that include examples or definitions of items in order to strike a balance between the two schools of thought while still accomplishing the goal of improving California's school facilities.

### *Format of Standards*

## ANALYSIS

Some states use handbooks of standards or guidelines based on building and safety codes and/or best practices. Others simply outline parameters or definitions to guide the individual in making appropriate ratings. The manner in which the standards are conveyed may have a significant bearing on the likelihood of conformity. If legislation prescribes that the standards are to be in the form of a tool (similar to the IEI), consideration should be made regarding the objectiveness of the tool. Developing a system for an evaluator that is as objective as possible to determine whether or not a specific component meets the standards would be important to the success of the tool. The following chart provides a summary of possible formatting options:

	FORMAT	BENEFITS	DRAWBACKS
OPTIONS	Checklist (similar to IEI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uniformity</li> <li>Helps smaller school districts without staff available to create</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not flexible, may not be suitable for all types of schools</li> <li>Unnecessary for many school districts that already have a tool</li> </ul>
	Narrative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flexibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May not be implemented as intended</li> <li>May be difficult to make meaningful comparison between two school districts</li> </ul>
	Narrative as well as providing an optional tool similar to the IEI (i.e. a checklist including optional comments sections).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flexibility</li> <li>Helps smaller school districts without staff available to create</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the tool is not used then there are the same drawbacks listed above under the narrative format.</li> </ul>
	Checklist as well as optional narrative/comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flexibility</li> <li>Helps smaller school districts without staff available to create</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If optional narration is not used then there are the same drawbacks listed above under the checklist format.</li> </ul>

Based on feedback received from the use of the IEI, some respondents desire to continue to have checklists, with instructions for evaluators to use, as it would provide the means to later rate and score the school. Others felt checklists are cumbersome, provide little flexibility, and are overly prescriptive. Most workgroup participants expressed a desire to see the standard developed in accordance with the third option, narrative listing and descriptions in statute with an optional tool or checklist, which would provide a balance for school districts large and small. Additionally, a best practices handbook should be provided in addition to the development of the standard to assist school districts with incorporating the standards into the other *Williams* case settlement requirements.

## RECOMMENDATION

While the specific format has not been selected, we recommend that it be based on a narrative description of the standards in statute to be used in conjunction with a tool or checklist created by the State or user that can be used to evaluate school sites.

### *Rating and Scoring Mechanism*

## ANALYSIS

While each component is evaluated using a rating mechanism, a scoring mechanism is not an element included in the current version of the IEI. There was not overwhelming consensus by the workgroup that a rating system should be part of the standards. As indicated in the research findings, there are a variety of rating mechanisms that could be implemented to provide an overall facility rating. The following chart includes a comparison of the benefits and drawbacks to utilizing a rating mechanism or a scoring mechanism:

			BENEFITS	DRAWBACKS
OPTIONS	Rating Mechanisms	Each component would be evaluated in the form of yes/no, good/fair/poor, or a numerical value.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uniformity</li> <li>Accountability- Provides a means of measurement against other schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definitions</li> <li>Subjectivity of the user</li> </ul>
	Scoring Mechanism	Overall evaluation of the condition of the school, each deficiency would be assigned a weight of measurement based upon the number of occurrences and the severity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Takes into account the severity of the deficiencies found at a particular school site.</li> <li>Accountability- Provides a means of measurement against other schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential impacts to other <i>Williams</i> requirements.</li> </ul>

A rating and scoring system would provide a meaningful measure of individual school sites, whether good or bad, and also allow for school districts to easily transfer the information to the SARC. It should be noted that it is only possible to implement a rating or scoring system if a checklist or tool is developed as part of the standard.

## RECOMMENDATION

The tool or checklist, whether created by the State or user, to evaluate school sites should contain a rating and scoring system.

### *Enforcement of Standards*

## ANALYSIS

A logical question to ask in creating state standards for school facility conditions is how will the standards be enforced. While there may be concern that these standards are enforced at the local level, there are various mechanisms built into the several

pieces of legislation implementing the *Williams* settlement that will assist in the enforcement of standards, for example:

- Modifications to the Uniform Complaint Process administered by the California Department of Education allow individuals to file complaints regarding school facility issues not meeting specific requirements.
- School districts and county offices of education annually reporting on the condition of school facilities in the School Accountability Report Card using these standards as a basis.
- Annual county office of education monitoring for those school sites identified in deciles 1-3 on the 2003 Academic Performance Index verifying SARC information and looking for emergency facilities needs. The results of the county office of education site visits are then reported to the school board.
- To access state school facility funding under the School Facility Program or the Deferred Maintenance Program, school districts or county offices of education certify that they have a plan in place to ensure their schools are in good repair.

Taking into account all of the above mechanisms, sufficient oversight and penalties for school districts exist as a result of the changes put into place as part of the *Williams* settlement. Workgroup participants echoed this sentiment as well. It is important to note that if a rating and scoring system is developed, the enforcement of standards could also evolve to the point of self-enforcement as schools and districts are held accountable and therefore strive to attain higher goals.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Existing mechanisms appear to be sufficient to ensure enforcement and accountability. At this time, we recommend that no additional measures be taken in this area.

## ***Integration with Other Williams Requirements***

## **ANALYSIS**

Another consideration is the impact that these standards will have on other *Williams* case settlement requirements. There are several different areas of the Education Code that references the term good repair that have bearing upon a school district's and county office of education's ability to participate in state school facility programs. The standards developed must be able to merge with those existing requirements as well as completion of the facilities portion of the SARC and the role of county offices of education in their oversight responsibilities of school sites within their county identified in deciles 1 to 3 on the 2003 API. *(Note: Staff is still researching this issue. Additional information may be incorporated into this section prior to its presentation to the SAB)*

## **RECOMMENDATION**

No recommendation at this time.

## CONCLUSION

This report purposefully did not result in the development of a specific instrument for California's school districts and county offices of education to use to evaluate and assess whether a particular school facility meets a state definition of good repair. Rather, this report addressed the criteria and options to be considered with recommendations on those options in developing a permanent State definition of good repair.

Developing a permanent good repair standard for school facilities is a challenging endeavor that must take into account a multitude of issues that exist due to the regional and economic diversity of California. In considering the various aspects of developing a standard that will be meaningful and lasting, it is important to strike a balance given the range of resources available to school districts. The research that led to this report suggests that this balance can be achieved by developing good repair standards in statute that:

- Delineate the components that must be clean, safe, and functional,
- Incorporate into statute the standards in narrative form with moderate detail,
- Develop an optional tool to be used in evaluating these school facility components that will enable a rating and scoring system,
- Ensure standards coincide with all the *Williams* settlement requirements,
- Affirm that sufficient enforcement of standards exist, and
- Define the goal as having school facilities and educational environment that are clean, safe and functional conducive to learning and equally shared by the children of California.

## APPENDIX A

### Pertinent Text from Education Code Section 17002

(d)(1) "Good repair" means the facility is maintained in a manner that assures that it is clean, safe, and functional as determined pursuant to an interim evaluation instrument developed by the Office of Public School Construction. The instrument shall not require capital enhancements beyond the standards to which the facility was designed and constructed.

(2) By January 25, 2005, the Office of Public School Construction shall develop the interim evaluation instrument based on existing prototypes and shall consult with county superintendents of schools and school districts during the development of the instrument. The Office of Public School Construction shall report and make recommendations to the Legislature and Governor not later than December 31, 2005, regarding options for state standards as an alternative to the interim evaluation instrument developed pursuant to paragraph (1). By September 1, 2006, the Legislature and Governor shall, by statute, determine the state standard that shall apply for subsequent fiscal years."



## APPENDIX B

### Interim Evaluation Instrument

*Will be included in the final version of this report.  
Copies may also be obtained from the OPSC Website.*

## APPENDIX C

### SB 550 Workgroup – School Facility Standards Interim Evaluation Instrument Survey

Your responses to the following survey will help assist the Office of Public School Construction in evaluating the effectiveness of the Interim Evaluation Instrument (IEI) as part of developing options for state standards required pursuant to Senate Bill 550, Chapter 900, Statutes 2004 (Vasconcellos). If possible, please complete and return the survey prior to **Wednesday, September 7<sup>th</sup>** via e-mail or fax (916.445.5526) to Melissa Ley. Your responses will be compiled and used at our meeting on September 8<sup>th</sup>.

Name of Person Completing this Survey:	Representing:
Number of Schools in District (if applicable):	Number of Deciles 1-3 schools (if applicable):

1. How many times have you utilized the IEI?
2. When using the IEI, were there any good repair items missing that you believe should be included? If so, please list and describe those items.
3. When using the IEI, were there any good repair items that did not seem to be necessary or relevant? If so, please list those items.
4. Was the IEI feasible to use in a school setting? Please explain.
5. Should the IEI have a rating system? If yes, please provide a suggested rating system?
6. Is the IEI helpful in completing the School Accountability Report Card? If no, why not?
7. Do you believe the IEI should be a tool that can be used by any individual with little or no experience in school facility maintenance and construction (i.e. focus is on a visual inspection) or designed for school facilities experts?
8. What do you like about the IEI?
9. What do you dislike about the IEI?
10. Please provide any other comments/feedback regarding the IEI.
11. When evaluating a school campus, would it be easier to evaluate by building or room (i.e. classroom, gym)?
12. Does your district/county office of education utilize the IEI or create its own evaluation tool? If the district/county office of education created its own tool, please explain why and attach a copy of the tool.
13. Do you know of any other school facility evaluation tools besides the IEI or an adaptation of one created by your district/county office of education that might be a useful alternative for us to consider? If so, please describe and provide a copy.

## APPENDIX D

Interim Evaluation Instrument Survey Results				
SURVEY QUESTIONS	SURVEY RESPONSES			COMMENTS
2. Good repair items missing from the IEI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cleanliness of the school</li> <li>Graffiti</li> <li>Extension cords used as a permanent power source</li> <li>Playground surface and equipment (more detail than IEI)</li> <li>Site exterior (more detail than IEI, such as lighting, signage, etc.)</li> <li>Parking lot surface</li> </ul>			
3. Unnecessary/Irrelevant good repair items on the IEI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sewer</li> </ul>			
4. Is the IEI feasible to use in a school setting?	Yes: 57%	No: 43%		<p>"Yes" Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Simple enough to be used by a principal or head custodian.</li> <li>It was simple to use, however the questions were worded awkwardly in some cases.</li> <li>It addressed the relevant building components and mechanical systems.</li> <li>Very easy to follow.</li> </ul> <p>"No" Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumbersome and unwieldy</li> <li>After the visit, the data has to be compiled and then entered onto the IEI. Using a classroom checklist is easier.</li> </ul>
5. Should the IEI have a rating system?	Yes: 57%	No: 43%		<p>"Yes" Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rating makes the inspection much easier.</li> <li>A 1-6 rating system is currently used. 1 represents an immediate repair need and 2-6 represents subsequent fiscal years, which then ties to the 5-year plan for Deferred Maintenance.</li> <li>Help school site staff know where their school fits – possibly a 10 point scale giving each question a numerical grade</li> </ul> <p>"No" Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Process may become more complex.</li> </ul>
6. Is the IEI helpful in completing the SARC?	Yes: 43%	No: 14%	N/A: 43%	<p>"Yes" Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies clearly the needed areas for improvement.</li> </ul> <p>"No" Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add a SARC verification line.</li> </ul>

SURVEY QUESTIONS	SURVEY RESPONSES	COMMENTS
7. Should the IEI be designed for a visual inspection by individuals with little or no experience, or school facility experts?	Visual Inspection: 72%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individuals who use the IEI should have a basic understanding of facilities systems, but does not need to be an expert.</li> <li>Having the inspection done by someone familiar with facilities and/or construction gives the inspection value. Having someone do an inspection without this background calls to question the integrity of the inspection.</li> </ul>
	School Facilities Experts: 14%	
	No Response/Response Not Valid: 14%	
8. What do you like about the IEI?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content</li> <li>Simple to read and fill out.</li> <li>Simplicity</li> <li>It was easy to understand, comprehensive, and focused on the important building components and mechanical systems.</li> </ul>	
9. What do you dislike about the IEI?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not conducive for a walking inspection.</li> <li>Strangely worded sentences.</li> <li>Double negatives are confusing.</li> <li>Format</li> <li>There was not enough room to write comments in the building/classroom and comment space.</li> <li>No numerical values – open to too much interpretation/scale of a problem might not be captured appropriately</li> </ul>	
10. Any other comments/feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change format.</li> <li>Add a rating system.</li> <li>Needs to be more user friendly.</li> <li>The IEI offers easy monitoring for continued improvement.</li> <li>Not sure it provides valuable information.</li> </ul>	
11. IEI Format: by building or room?	Room: 71%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rooms are easier to monitor on follow-up repairs.</li> <li>By room: usually the facility inspection is done jointly with textbook adequacy survey.</li> <li>Room by room could get very repetitive and cumbersome in many situations.</li> </ul>
	Building: 29%	

SURVEY QUESTIONS	SURVEY RESPONSES	COMMENTS
12. Does your district/county office of education utilize the IEI or create its own evaluation tool?	IEI: 57%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our evaluation tool contains the items on the IEI, but additional risk management issues were added. In addition, it was made to more closely tie with the Routine Restricted Maintenance and the Deferred Maintenance Programs.</li> <li>The IEI was too difficult to fill out and there was no section to indicate whether the school was in good repair.</li> </ul>
	Other: 43%	

## Acknowledgements

*The Office of Public School Construction would like to acknowledge and extend our appreciation to the following individuals for their participation in this project:*

Duwayne Brooks, Consultant  
Coalition for Adequate School Housing

Mr. Walt Byrd, Assistant Superintendent  
Clovis Unified School District

Mr. William Cornelison, Superintendent  
Lake County Office of Education

Mr. Dennis Dunston, AIA, Principal  
HMC Architects

Ms. Beth Hamby, Director of Facilities and Grants  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Ms. Judy Jonas, Assistant Principal  
Pomona Unified School District

Mr. Bob Nicholson, Senior Director of School Facilities Planning Services  
San Diego County Office of Education

Mr. John Palmer, Director of Planning and Construction  
San Juan Unified School District

Ms. Jamie Perry, Associate Director  
Fresno County Office of Education

Mr. Daniel G. Villanueva, Assistant Director  
Los Angeles County Office of Education

Mr. Fred Yeager, Assistant Director of Facilities  
California Department of Education